

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated February 2, 2007, claims 1, 13 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112(2), as being indefinite due to informalities therein, all of which have been corrected. All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in full compliance of all provisions of §112(2).

Claims 1, 3, 8, 14, 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Born, et al. in view of Kuth, et al.

Claims 2, 4-7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 17-20, 22, 23 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Born, et al. and Kuth, et al., further in view of Banks, et al.

Claims 11-13 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Born, et al. and Kuth, et al., further in view of Banks, et al. and Cosman.

In response, each of the independent claims of the application has been amended to state that the image which is displayed on the display screen is a subtraction image, that is obtained by first acquiring an empty image of the patient bed with no patient thereon, and subsequently acquiring an actual image of the patient on the patient bed, and then subtracting the empty image from the actual image to obtain a subtraction image. It is in this displayed subtraction image that the suggested scan area is then presented at the display.

The dependent claims have been editorially amended as well in order to be consistent with the amended independent claims.

Support for these amendments to the independent claims is present in the specification as originally filed at page 9.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references of record discloses or suggests a method or an arrangement as set forth in the amended claims.

In the Born, et al. reference, only an image of the patient on the patient bed is obtained and subsequently processed. There is no teaching or suggestion in the Born, et al. reference to obtain an empty image of the patient bed without the patient thereon, and consequently there is no suggested in the Born, et al. reference to make any use of such an empty image.

The same is true of the Kuth, et al. image, wherein at all times an image of the patient on a patient bed is obtained and utilized. Therefore, even if the Born et al. system were modified in accordance with the teachings of the Kuth reference noted by the examiner, neither a method nor an apparatus as set forth in the amended claims of the present application would result.

Therefore, none of claims 1, 3, 8, 14, 16 or 21 would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the field of medical image acquisition and processing under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), based on the teachings of Born, et al. and Kuth, et al.

As to the rejections wherein addition references were relied upon in combination with the Born, et al./Kuth, et al. combination, applicants submit, for the above reasons, that even if the Born, et al./Kuth, et al. combination were further modified in accordance with the teachings of those additional references, the subject matter of the dependent claims still would not result.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

 (Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP

CUSTOMER NO. 26574

Patent Department

6600 Sears Tower

233 South Wacker Drive

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312/258-5790

Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4959393.1